



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,192	06/16/2005	Gordon Feingold	09138.0074	2551
63432 7590 08/25/2009 DAKO/FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413				
EXAMINER				
GORDON, BRIAN R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1797				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/25/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/539,192

Applicant(s)

FEINGOLD ET AL.

Examiner

Brian R. Gordon

Art Unit

1797

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 318-357 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 318-357 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed July 10, 2009, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 318-338 under 102 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Tseung et al. US 6,998,270.

Applicant asserts Lemme does not disclose the use of a bridge. However it should be recognized that bridges (and other components, such as servers, routers, gateways, etc.) are conventionally well known equipment employed within the configuration of networks to allow for communication between network devices (computers/controllers). Furthermore sending, relaying, and receiving commands, instructions, protocols over computer networks are conventionally known.

As stated in the prior Office Action, the claims do not appear to claim any novel aspects of the use of computer networks. Computer networks are staple components of today's society. It is readily known that WAN and LAN networks are employed for sending various types of data (including encrypted, i.e. internet or intranets) in various environments ranging from private homes, businesses, hospitals (see paragraph 240), laboratories, etc. The use of networking and backup hardware/software is inherent in a network configuration such as that taught by Lemme et al. (see also Showalter, provisional application 60/487,998, prior art submitted by applicant).

It is readily known that computers are equipped to be included within networks. One can go to "network connections" on a PC and view bridge settings and other connections. Furthermore it is known that PCs are equipped with web browsing and troubleshooting/diagnostic software.

The previous 112 rejections are hereby withdrawn. It should be noted that applicant has elected not to specify what or who performs the active steps (such as sending, receiving, relaying commands, running diagnostic tests, troubleshooting, obtaining an estimate, etc.). Therefore this does not preclude the steps from being performed manually or by an automated device.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 318-338 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant has amended claims, but failed to mention where the amendments are supported within the original specification. The examiner fails to locate where the specification discloses a stainer network is connected to controllers located "outside" the stainer network. While paragraph [0075] discloses a bridge may be used to connect the stainer network to other networks, the specification

does not disclose amended portion of the claim. The examiner fails to locate where the term "controller" appears in the specification. As such, applicant should specify where each of the amendments and new claims supported within the original specification.

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 318, 321-322, 324, and 339 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As to claim 318, it is unclear what constitutes "outside" the stainer network. The claim does not specify what the boundaries of the network are for one to determine what applicant considers as outside or inside the stainer network.

While applicant has chosen to amend the claim to refer to a stainer network, the claim only requires at least one stainer and at least one controller. Furthermore no structure has been provided as to define what applicant considers as a stainer. As such, any device that can be employed to perform a staining/smearing process can be considered a stainer.

It is unclear what is the difference in "sending commands" and "relaying commands" (claims 321-322, 324, 339). For the purpose of examination, both are considered the same.

Claim 321 and 339 recite the limitation "the plurality of stainers" in lines 5-6. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 339-357 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The claim asserts the method is for performing operations. There are no operations claimed. Sending commands and receiving responses over a network do not define an operation. It is unclear how one would perform an operation as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
10. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
11. Claims 318-357 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tseung et al. US 6,998,270.

Tseung et al. discloses an automated staining system and a reagent container designed for use with the automated staining apparatus. The device includes a control system 28 that includes a data storage unit or medium for storing information, such as staining protocols, and retrieving that stored information on demand. The control system 28 is interfaced by a communication link 31, such as a local area network, so that the autostainer 10 may exchange information with another information storage device 32, such as another laboratory instrument or a remote computer system. For example, the control system 28 may be capable of exporting a staining record containing information such as the staining protocol, reagent information, and the like to the information storage device 32 over the communications link 31. The information storage device 32 would associate the staining record with existing patient information in a patient record

database or a laboratory information system and provide, associate, and/or store the staining record with that information for future report generation. The information storage device may also perform statistical analysis on multiple staining records to, for example, determine compliance with regulatory standards.

The control system 28 is also capable of importing or retrieving information from the information storage device 32 via communications link 31. The imported information may comprise a staining record containing protocol information that the control system 28 can use as a template for staining one or more of the slides 12. The ability to import the staining protocol from device 32 precludes manually inputting the information using touchscreen display 30. The imported information may also include patient information, which may be associated with the staining protocol and/or stored by the control system 28. One use for the associated patient record and staining protocol, whether residing on control system 28 or on information storage device 32, is quality control and quality assurance documentation.

While Tseung does not specify the use of a bridge connector, such hardware and its usage is conventionally known in the art (see Response to Arguments; see Also DeSouza, US 5,245,606). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a bridge to connect multiple computers, networks, and other components to allow for data transmission therebetween.

12. Claims 318-357 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemme et al. US 2002/011049 A1.

Lemme et al. disclose a method and apparatus for an automated biological reaction system. In the processing of a biological reaction system, there is a need for consistently placing an amount of fluid on a slide. In order to operate the automated biological reaction system more reliably, the system is designed in modular pieces with higher functions performed by a host device and the execution of the staining operations performed by remote devices. Also, to reliably catalog data which is used by the automated biological reaction system, data is loaded to a memory device, which in turn is used by the operator to update the operator's databases. The generation of the sequence of steps for the automated biological reaction device based on data loaded by the operator, including checks to determine the ability to complete the run. (Abstract).

FIG. 5A, shows a block diagram of the automated biological reaction system 150. The automated biological reaction system 150 is segmented into a host device 32 (server), which includes a typical personal computer, and at least one remote device 166, which includes the automated biological reaction device in FIGS. 2 and 6A. In the preferred embodiment, there are up to eight remote devices 166 which communicate with the host device 32. Each remote device 166 on the network has a unique address so that each remote device 166 may be identified and individually controlled by the host device 32. As described subsequently in FIG. 5B, the automated biological reaction system 150 can support up to eight remote devices 166 due to the 3 bits (values 0-7) dedicated to the addressing of the remote devices 166. A rotary switch is provided on the remote device 166 to allow for the identification and the changing of the 3 bit address for each remote device 166. All host messages include this address in them, as

described subsequently in FIG. 5B. However, the number of remote devices 166 can be smaller or larger than eight, depending on the capacity requirements or practical limitations of the laboratory in terms of space. Moreover, the remote devices 166 may be immunohistochemistry staining modules, another type of instrument that performs a different type of staining, or another type of medical testing device. (paragraph 105).

Communication between the host device 32 and the remote devices 166 is accomplished using a serial RS-485 link, which serves as a network, that supports one host and up to 32 remotes at one time. In the preferred embodiment, addressing of the remote devices 166 allows up to 8 remote devices to communicate with the host at one time. The RS-485 link has at least two pairs of lines for communication, one pair for transmitting and one pair for receiving. The remote devices 166 which are connected to the network "hear" the host messages but do not "hear" other remote messages. In the preferred embodiment, all communications begin with a host message, followed a short time later by a response by a remote device 166 if present. (sending/receiving) If the host device 32 sends a message and there is no remote device 166 to respond to it, the host device 32 times out. In this manner, the communication provides a simple, collision-free link between the host device 32 and the remote devices 166. In an alternative embodiment, the remote devices 166, in addition to communicating with the host device 32, address each other. For example, the remote devices 166 address each other using the unique 3 bit address, sending information about staining runs, which are described subsequently. (paragraph 106).

The user database, which is required by the regulations, contains various tables including the registration, receive and quality control tables for use by the operator. Within each of the registration, receive and quality control tables, there are five different types of categories: (1) antibodies; (2) reagents; (3) kits; (4) consumables, and (5) control slides. (paragraph 226).

The claims do not appear to claim any novel aspects of the use of computer networks. Computer networks are staple components of today's society. It is readily known that WAN and LAN networks are employed for sending various types of data (including encrypted, i.e. internet or intranets) in various environments ranging from private homes, businesses, hospitals (see paragraph 240), laboratories, etc. The use of networking and backup hardware/software is inherent in a network configuration such as that taught by Lemme et al. (see also Showalter, provisional application 60/487,998, prior art submitted by applicant).

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

DeSouza disclose the use of network bridges.

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian R. Gordon whose telephone number is 571-272-1258. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 1st Fri. Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 571-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brian R Gordon/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1797